

Remarks

The Official Action rejected claims 1-29. Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 15, 22, 23. Claims 1-29 are now pending in the present application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims in the light of the points that follow.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 112, First Paragraph

The Official Action rejected claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant's specification has been amended to recite "the system 200 may comprises a first unit that may output an AC output from an AC input voltage". Applicant believes that the objection to the specification has been overcome.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 112, Second Paragraph

The Official Action rejected claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential circuit cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connection. Applicant's claim 1, lines 2-3 has been amended to recite "a first unit that outputs an AC output voltage from an AC input voltage". Applicant believes that the objection to claims 1-7 has been overcome. Further, Applicant's claim 8, lines 6-7

has been amended to recite “an inverter that converts the battery voltage into an AC output voltage”. Applicant believes that the objection to claims 8-14 has been overcome.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 102 (Yeh)

The Official Action rejected claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yeh (5,347,164). Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 15, 22, 23.

As is well-established, in order to successfully assert a *prima facie* case of anticipation, the Official Action must provide a single prior art document that includes every element and limitation of the claim or claims being rejected. Therefore, if even one element or limitation is missing from the cited document, the Official Action has not succeeded in making a *prima facie* case.

Claims 1-29

Applicant respectfully points out that claims 1-29 contain limitations not taught by the cited reference. Claim 1-7 requires the first unit and the second unit are provided in a housing of the computing device. Claims 8-14 requires the rectifier, the converter and the inverter are provided in a housing of the computing device. Claims 15-21 requires integrating a uninterruptible power supply and a power supply unit into a housing of the computing device. Claims 22-29 requires a housing of the processor to accommodate the power supply system.

The Official Action appears to rely on Yeh, Fig. 2 (C2, L33) to (C3, L46) for a teaching of a system to supply power to a load. Applicant respectfully indicates that

Applicant has been unable to find any teaching of limitations mentioned above in Yeh. Withdrawal of the present rejection is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner elects to maintain the present rejection, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner identify where Yeh teaches ***the first unit and the second unit are provided in a housing of the computing device***. Furthermore, if the Examiner continues to rely on Yeh Fig. 2, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide additional explanation regarding how Yeh pertains to the limitations of claims 1-29.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 102 (Ulinski)

The Official Action rejected claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ulinski (6,700,802). Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 15, 22, 23.

As is well-established, in order to successfully assert a *prima facie* case of anticipation, the Official Action must provide a single prior art document that includes every element and limitation of the claim or claims being rejected. Therefore, if even one element or limitation is missing from the cited document, the Official Action has not succeeded in making a *prima facie* case.

Claims 1-29

Applicant respectfully points out that claims 1-29 contain limitations not taught by the cited reference. Claim 1-7 requires the first unit and the second unit are provided in a housing of the computing device. Claims 8-14 requires the rectifier, the

converter and the inverter are provided in a housing of the computing device. Claims 15-21 requires integrating a uninterruptible power supply and a power supply unit into a housing of the computing device. Claims 22-29 requires a housing of the processor to accommodate the power supply system.

The Official Action appears to rely on Ulinski, Fig. 1A (C3, L13) to (C8, L6) for a teaching of a system to supply power. Applicant respectfully indicates that Applicant has been unable to find any teaching of limitations mentioned above in Ulinski. Withdrawal of the present rejection is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner elects to maintain the present rejection, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner identify where Ulinski teaches ***the first unit and the second unit are provided in a housing of the computing device.*** Furthermore, if the Examiner continues to rely on Ulinski Fig. 1A, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide additional explanation regarding how Ulinski pertains to the limitations of claims 1-29.

Conclusion

The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete response to the Official Action. Applicant submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is requested, and allowance of the pending claims is earnestly solicited.

Should it be determined that an additional fee is due under 37 CFR §§1.16 or 1.17, or any excess fee has been received, please charge that fee or credit the amount of overcharge to deposit account #02-2666. If the Examiner believes that there are any informalities which can be corrected by an Examiner's amendment, a telephone call to the undersigned at (503) 439-8778 is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 31, 2009

/Gregory D. Caldwell/
Gregory D. Caldwell
Reg. No. 39,926

Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP
1279 Oakmead Parkway,
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(503) 439-8778